DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 804 EA 032 783

AUTHOR	Allen, Ricky Lee; Howard, Natasha
TITLE	The Promise of Multiculturalism and the Permanence of Racism.
PUB DATE	2003-04-22
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Blacks; Culturally Relevant Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnocentrism; Intergroup Relations; Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Bias; Racial Discrimination; *Racial Relations; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	Brown v Board of Education; *White Supremacy

ABSTRACT

Despite many heroic victories, the Civil Rights Movement has failed to significantly transform the underlying structure of White domination [according to this didactic essay on multiculturalism and racism]. It can also be said that the multicultural movement, which was an extension of the Civil Rights Movement, has failed to transform the deep structure of White supremacy. The authors believe that if multicultural education is to live up to its promise, we must continue to interrogate the ways in which it, too, reinvents and reproduces Whiteness. We need a more direct pedagogical approach to the problem of White supremacy, which means transforming those Whites who are willing to unlearn their White ideologies and become solidary [sic] with people of color and focusing more on a race-radical education for people of color that works for solidarity across non-White groups. We hope this paper will stir multicultural educators and scholars to intervene in the role that multiculturalism plays in White supremacy. However, we believe this intervention cannot occur if we do not first begin to understand how the hidden curriculum of multiculturalism favors those already privileged. (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

The Promise of Multiculturalism and the Permanence of Racism

ED 479 804

Ricky Lee Allen
Natasha Howard
University of New Mexico

Paper presented at the
Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois
April 22, 2003

Contact Information
Dr. Ricky Lee Allen
University of New Mexico
College of Education
Department of Language, Literacy, & Sociocultural Studies
Hokona Hall, Room 209-Zuni
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131-1231
(505) 277-7247
rlallen@unm.edu

EA 032 783

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Promise of Multiculturalism and the Permanence of Racism

Despite many heroic victories, the Civil Rights Movement has failed to significantly transform the underlying structure of white domination (Bell, 1992). To add insult to injury, many whites now believe that *they* are racially oppressed, even though whites as a group have retained their systemic power and privilege throughout the post-Civil Rights era (Gallagher, 1997). In response to their fear of losing status, angered whites have become politically mobile around anti-Civil Rights legislation and have sought to repeal affirmative action and bilingual education (Lipsitz, 1998). For example, the broad appeal of Propositions 209 and 227 to white voters in California demonstrates that race relations even in a highly Democratic state has taken a turn. Currently, we are awaiting word from the U.S. Supreme Court on the University of Michigan affirmative action case. If the court rules in favor of the white plaintiffs, who contend that they are the victims of racial quotas, this case could potentially destabilize, if not eliminate, affirmative action programs in institutions of higher education around the country.

It can also be said that the multicultural movement, which was an extension of the Civil Rights Movement (Banks, 1994; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; McIntyre, 1997; Sleeter & Grant, 1988), has failed to transform the deep structure of white supremacy. This realization is distressing given the progressive roots and origin of multiculturalism, which made it seem, at least on the surface, that multicultural education had real

transformative possibilities. As an outgrowth of the African American ethnic studies movement, and subsequently of other ethnic studies movements, multiculturalism began as a grassroots project to "reform the total school environment, not just the curriculum" (Banks, 1992, p. 282). It differs significantly from other educational fields in that scholars and educators of color developed it, or at least were its central figures in its creation. Its leading theorists and practitioners have imagined it as a transformation of pedagogy, administration, policy, evaluation, community relations, and psychological services that would create schools where students of color to truly have an equal opportunity to learn (Banks, 1992). In fact, Banks (1992) charges multiculturalism with the promise of helping the U.S. to "actualize its democratic legacy and ideals" (p. 284). Although we do not agree that a country that has never come to terms with its history of slavery, conquest, and genocide can claim a legacy of democracy, we do agree that the U.S. needs to live up to its ideals of democracy. And, we hope that multiculturalism can in fact fulfill its promise in leading us in that direction. But criticism is necessary first so that we might re-imagine multicultural theory and practice. As we approach the fifty-year anniversary of the *Brown* decision, now seems like a good time to reassess.

Criticism of multiculturalism is nothing new. For decades now, the political right has charged multiculturalism with denigrating the traditions of Western "civilization" and promoting divisive identity politics (Cheney, 1987 & 1990). This claim is highly suspect since it assumes that a just and unified nation existed prior to the multicultural

movement (Banks, 1992). Another branch of right-wing critique contends that unification *was* achieved in the 1960s and any attempt to attend to difference and power divides an already unified nation. Through their colorblind ideology, the right fails to recognize that no racial equality, and thus no national unity, existed before or now exists after the Civil Rights Movement. From the left, the criticism is that multiculturalism is too complicitous with the existing policies and practices of educational institutions. Multicultural reforms are merely coopted by dominant interests within educational institutions (see Banks, 1992). The left also claims that multiculturalism is too superficial and does not maintain a consistent critique of structures of domination, opting instead for notions such as "tolerance" and cultural essentialism (McLaren, 1997). Christine Sleeter counters the criticisms of the left and right by suggesting that

> ...both groups support their arguments against multicultural education by largely dismissing the writings and research of its major theorists, by using examples of teaching and activities that violate the theoretical principles of multicultural education, and by ignoring many of the realities of today's classrooms (as cited by Banks, 1992, p. 282).

In other words, Sleeter is arguing that both sides are out of touch with the general reality of classroom diversity, multicultural theory, and multicultural pedagogy, choosing instead to focus on straw man arguments and exceptional cases while avoiding issues of practice.

We do agree with Sleeter in that perspectives on multiculturalism need to be more grounded in the realities of diversity, schools, and society. However, we argue that multiculturalism, like any movement or reform, cannot be saved from criticism by separating its intentions from its effects. We have no doubt that they are fantastic race-radical teachers, scholars, administrators, and community activists who do great work under the umbrella of the multicultural movement. But the fact is that multiculturalism has become an institutionalized ideology and mode of practice throughout elementary, secondary, and higher education. It has become a feature of teacher credential programs and state guidelines for obtaining a teaching credential. It has become an aspect of school district curriculum and many districts have administrators who oversee multicultural education departments. Some multiculturalists might be quick to say, "Yes, but these so-called multicultural educators are not being consistent with the most transformative or radical theory and practice that multiculturalism has to offer?" To that we would agree. We do believe that there are very insightful forms of multiculturalism rooted in race-radicalism. Nevertheless, the movement has been coopted by conservatives, liberals, etc. Most of the practitioners of multiculturalism, broadly defined, are white teachers. This is the reality of multiculturalism and we cannot ignore it because if we do we will miss the underlying reasons why the movement has played out the way it has.

The irony about multiculturalism is that much of the multiculturalism being written in academia and practiced in schools throughout the U.S. serves more as an alibi for the furthering of white supremacy and less as a radical project for the transformation of it. For multiculturalism to live up to its promise helping the U.S. live up to its democratic ideals we believe that it must be much more serious about the actual *racialized social system* (see Bonilla-Silva, 1996) of white supremacy in which it operates. . We believe that a truly transformative multiculturalism cannot avoid the naming and deconstruction of the racialized social system of white supremacy, which afterall is the reason why multiculturalism was needed. Multiculturalists have far too often yielded to white power by not talking about it. We wish to bring this argument back to the forefront of multicultural thinking. One could argue that multiculturalism is premised upon a challenge to white power. However, we seriously doubt that "new recruits" into the multicultural movement, vis-à-vis its institutionalization across national teacher education programs, necessarily understand the roots of multiculturalism. In fact, most would resist it if presented with the politics and history given that they are white educators who do not like discussing their own white power and privilege let alone white supremacy as a social structure that must be abolished. It is this more structural notion of white supremacy and its functional relationship with schooling and power that we argue is fundamentally lacking in all but a minority of the ideological camps of the current multiculturalism discourse.

To further develop our critique of multiculturalism, we must first turn back to our critique of the Civil Rights Movement and develop it further. Our critique is a structural one. Structural theories are devised across time and space and are predictive of contemporary events, if they are of any worth. If we look at white domination as structural, we should understand that our racial history repeats itself, though the façade may change. Thus, neither the lackluster outcomes of the Civil Rights Movement nor the recent backlash of the white community should surprise us. Rather than being an historical anomaly, it is quite consistent with the legacy of "progress" against racism in the U.S. The historical pattern that has emerged suggests that for every period of racial progress, there has followed a period of racial regress accompanied by various sociocultural constructs that divert attention away from the realities of white power. One of the most obvious and well-known examples being that after the abolition of slavery came Jim Crow and other forms of segregationist practices. In our current post-Civil Rights context, "progress" has been followed by imprisonment, urban disinvestment, colorblind ideology, and denigrating media images like the "welfare queen." So, we should not be surprised at the erosion of the Civil Rights Movement, nor should we be surprised at the cooptation of multiculturalism by white supremacist beliefs and practices.[1] Also, if we are paying attention to this nation's history, we should not be surprised if the situation worsens over the next few decades.

[1] And by "white supremacist" we mean any and all ideologies that support, consciously or not, the system

The current and historical pattern of race relations in the U.S. begs the following question: "Why do whites, as a political and cultural group, always seem to develop second thoughts about the concessions[2] that they give from time to time to people of color?" There are at least two ways to address this question. The first and most common suggests that the moral righteousness of an anti-white supremacist movement causes whites to have some kind of moral awakening, which results in social and legal concessions (e.g., Civil Rights Movement). The subsequent lapse back into racial regress is explained in terms of whites falling back to sleep (e.g., the Conservative Restoration). A second and alternative reading argues that maybe there was no moral "waffling." Instead, both the initial concessions and the subsequent attack on those same concessions are ideologically consistent. In other words, the fruits of progress contain the seeds of regress. "Progress" and "regress," in terms of the rights of people of color, only occur when they are needed to further the powers and privileges of whites. The structuration of progress has been so fraught with loopholes and diluted challenges to white power that it literally shapes the new façade of race relations and white backlash while doing little to change the underlying structure. White power morphs during periods of racial

---

that bestows power and privilege on those who become identified as "white" at the same time as it imposes disempowerment and disprivilege on those who become identified as "people of color."

[2] Concessions usually come in the form of remediations, which are the actions taken as a result of legal decisions.

"progress," thus giving the impression of change when really what happens is whiteness is reconfiguring its power in the face of external pressures and internal desires.

To further understand this critique of the Civil Rights Movement and its connection to multiculturalism in our analysis, we will use a theoretical framework proposed by Derrick Bell (1995), that reveals how whites and white power benefited to the detriment of people of color. First, his *interest-convergence theory* suggests that African Americans and other people of color will only make gains in racial equality when it is consistent with the political and economic needs of whites. Second, any kind of advancement, so-called, will only occur to the degree that it does not interrupt or seriously challenge white privilege. Thus, rather than seeing racism as a diminishing and floating social phenomenon, interest-convergence theory suggests that racism is much more resilient and entrenched than many realize. In fact, it has a certain sort of permanence, which is evidenced by 500 years of progress, regress, and continued white domination (Bell, 1992). And for white racism to end, the world would be so completely transformed that it is hard to imagine what the changes might be. But, what we do know is that the types of changes tried thus far have not eliminated white supremacy.

In his analysis of legislation regarding the *Brown v. Board of Education*, Bell (1995) notes that although Blacks had fought for more than 100 years to end segregated and unequal school systems they were unsuccessful in their demands. Thus, we must be curious as to why whites and a white dominated legal system would give in at all and, in

1954, finally rule that *Plessy v. Ferguson* was unconstitutional. Bell argues that this sudden change was not simply a result of whites gaining a conscience towards immoral and discriminatory practices against Blacks. Instead, the reality is that an end to segregated schools masked white racism through the veneer of integration and, more importantly, privileged whites in various ways at this particular point in history. First, in an effort to out compete dominant communist nations (e.g., China and the Soviet Union) for control of Third World countries (see Spring, 1998), the U.S. had to appeal to people of color in these countries by ending the apartheid in the U. S. Second, white America wanted to prevent the spread of communism within its own borders. Blacks who had fought in World War II were vocal about not being considered full citizens. There was fear that communism, which *in theory* did not practice racial apartheid, would become attractive to millions of oppressed Blacks in the U.S. Finally, white policymakers needed the South to become economically more profitable (Bell, 1992).

In the aftermath of Civil Rights victories, there have been significant changes in education. Our purpose in this paper is to demonstrate how white supremacist aspects of multiculturalism manifest in multiple ways as an instance of interest convergence. For instance, rather than supporting the rise of Black Nationalism and race consciousness, the larger effect of multiculturalism has been to quash these radical projects. White America feared a growing militancy among Black youths. Even within the peaceful Civil Rights Movement there were divisions and groups that later separated to join a movement that

was indeed more race conscious (Davis, 2001) which advocated for, among other things, dismantling white privilege and a redistribution of resources and power. A way to control this kind of resistance movement was through the indoctrination of students of color in an education that rejected any form of a radical race consciousness in favor of liberal ideas about colorblindness (Bell, 1995; Guiner & Torres, 2001, Pellar, 1995). A colorblind philosophy, which is at the root of most of what passes as multiculturalism in our schools, favors white supremacy precisely because it renders invisible the structural ways in which people of color are oppressed (Tatum, 1997). Colorblindness ignores the history that supports and maintains a racial hierarchy. It also mistakenly assumes that people can be taught to not see race. Not surprisingly a colorblind philosophy found its way into the heart of multicultural practice in our nation's schools despite the best efforts of some race-radical multiculturalists. The authors contend that this occurs because multiculturalism was not intended to give students the kind of knowledge that would facilitate their understanding *of racial oppression in material ways*. Yes, it is true that multicultural, or "multiethnic," education grew out of the work of early African American scholars. However, much of their radicalism, which in the case of W. E. B. Du Bois was a profound critique of white supremacy as a determining structure that shapes labor and race relations, was stripped away and reached very few students or teachers.

Another point to consider is the hegemonic way concepts like "culture" and "ethnicity" are frequently constructed in multicultural agendas. They are often used in

such a way as to diminish a recognition and understanding of the power inherent in racial oppression. After all, "race" is related to but not synonymous with "culture" and "ethnicity" (Omi & Winant, 1994). Many multiculturalists shun the race and focus instead on culture and ethnicity. For example, pluralist multiculturalism works towards the elimination of prejudice and discrimination by deconstructing negative racial stereotypes and paying particular attention to the ways in which ethnic groups are similar rather than different. As a result, students are likely to encounter stories about the history of the struggles of all ethnic groups. However, this does not adequately address the fact that historically inclusion or exclusion has depended upon the ability of ethnic groups to assimilate into a white racial group. Access was granted to European ethnic groups with the idea that this would protect the status and power of whites as a monolithic racial group (Du Bois, 1935; Roediger, 1999). While it is true that whites Americans represent a diverse population of ethnic heritages, it is also true that European descendants as a whole benefit from a system that privileged white ethnics (Omi & Winant, 1994). By not addressing this, but rather constructing all ethnic groups as having similar struggles, multiculturalism eliminates the power element of white racism. In the end, racism is equated with isolated events of prejudice and discrimination, thus making it a useful tool for diverting attention away from the structural ways in which racial oppression functions. This ultimately serves the status quo.

But to really understand how multiculturalism operates as a form of interest convergence we must consider the racialization of the teacher workforce that occurred as a result of integration and the subsequent development of multiculturalism into a form of validation for a white teacher workforce. In fact, the racialization of the teacher workforce is as an important case study of how multiculturalism functions as an interest-convergence mechanism. Therefore, we will devote the next few pages to this topic.

It has been estimated that some 30,000 or more African American teachers and administrators were dismissed from their jobs following desegregation (Siddle-Walker, 2001). Although we often think of integration as providing Black students access to white schools, it also has provided white teachers access to teaching jobs in Black communities. Today what we find in urban classrooms is an overwhelmingly white teacher workforce for students of color.[3] In this way we can view the emergence of multiculturalism in light of the need for white teachers to acquire some kind of training to assist them in gaining legitimate access to communities of color.

From the beginning of the movement to desegregate schools there was concern over the outcome of integration for Black schoolteachers and administrators. Would this kind of legislation protect Black professionals in the field or would their jobs go to white educators? Although there were many inequalities inherent in segregated schooling

[3] A 1991 National Education Association report indicates that the teacher workforce in the U.S. is comprised of 86.5 percent Whites, 8 percent Blacks, and 3 percent Latinos (Acuña, 1996).

policies and practices, there were a few benefits for the Black community. For example, segregated schools provided Black students an educational environment in which they were not assumed to be inferior, nor were they taught that their "place" in society was behind Whites (Foster, 1997; Irvine & Irvine, 1983; Siddle-Walker, 2001). There was an "ethic of caring" (Ladson-Billings, 1994) due to the fact that Black teachers often came from and resided in the same communities in which they taught. As such, they had vested interests in the students and community. Teaching had long been an inroad to a middle-class profession for Blacks. One of the few that were available. While there is a need for continued research on the pedagogical practices of Black teachers, evidence suggests that they challenged the constructs of racism while also working to provide students with other necessary skills (Foster, 1997; Siddle-Walker, 2001).

The issue of how school desegregation would effect Black educators and administrators was so significant that it was often "theorized" about in Black newspapers and educational journals. In a 1953 editorial in the *Journal of Negro Education*, Chas Thompson concluded that Black educators had nothing to fear since there were not enough white teachers to fill the positions that would be needed to support the kind of expanded enrollment desegregation would create. Even if Black students were integrated into formerly all white schools there were not enough available teachers to meet their needs. Under these circumstances, the laws of supply and demand would require white schools to accept Black teachers.

So, many assumed that one of the benefits of integration would be that Black educators and students would acquire the "better" resources they had been denied for so long. The importance of this point should not be overlooked. The goals of Black educators and school administrators in many communities were to acquire better facilities, books, and other educational resources. As was the case for many Black schools, they received books and other hand-me-downs from white schools. Keeping mind that both Black and white schools were funded by the government, the vast majority of funding was allocated for white schools. The expenditure rate per white child was sometimes double that for Black children (Siddle-Walker, 2001). In many cases funding for Black schools was contingent upon the principle that they should provide only an industrial based education for Black students. Particularly in the south, white elites decided that if Blacks were going to be educated, it would not be in such a way as to challenge or undermine the privileged position and power of whites (Morris & Morris, 2002).

Demands for equal work opportunities coincided with demands for equal educational opportunities. In a study of how the Brown decision affected Milwaukee schools, Jack Dougherty (1998) notes that in many northern cities the Brown decision was integrated into existing organizing struggles around employment and housing issues. In this case, the principles behind the integration of students could be used to push for the integration of teachers, therefore providing increased job opportunities in an effort to

strengthen a Black teacher workforce. Even well trained Black teachers faced the dual constraints of sometimes not finding positions in the few Black schools that were open and also not being allowed to teach in white schools.

Vanessa Siddle-Walker (2001) explains that racist employment policies had implications for the development of professional Black teacher organizations. Since Black educators were not allowed voting rights in white teacher associations they developed their own associations for professional development. A major goal was to lobby for fair compensation for Black teachers. In an interesting case in Atlanta a white teachers union, which represented some 90% of white educators in Atlanta, refused to consider equal pay for Black educators. Rather than comply, in 1956 they chose to join the school board in a fight against any kinds of equal salary or integration for Black teachers (Allison, 1999). Just prior to the Brown decision the *Journal of Negro Education* reported that in some states, Black educators had more advanced degrees on average than did white teachers. Nevertheless, their pay did not reflect their advanced level of educational training or experience.

Within two years of the Brown decision there was concern as to why integration did not include the placement of more Black teachers in white schools. Organizations like the Urban League began to gather data on this issue in various cities. The Brown decision presented an interesting context for Black activists. They could make a good argument for "full" integration, which also included integrating Black teachers and

administrators into previously restricted white schools. With the political climate being what it was, there was the impending threat of lawsuits that would require addressing this contradiction in ideology. Nevertheless, the Brown decision did not necessarily mean that whites would not protect their interests in a white educational system. Integrating Black students into a "white" space had been ripe with violence and other forms of resistance on the parts of whites. But the integration of Black teachers and administrators would have been a more serious challenge to the loss of white power and privilege in educational institutions.

Whites were so threatened by the potential presence of Black educators in white schools that they made a concerted effort to limit the opportunities available to Black educators. It is no coincidence that in the aftermath of the Brown decision there was a move to the use standardized testing to determine teacher placement and salaries. The same standardized test that had had little importance and had been criticized as having little relevance for what makes a good teacher was all of a sudden transformed into an important instrument in teacher licensing procedures. In public, the standardized test was thought to be a neutral and unbiased tool for interpreting the skills individuals possessed for being a good teacher. In private, the test was deemed "reliable" because there was clear evidence demonstrating that Blacks did less well on these standardized tests than whites. As such, these standardized tests became a useful tool for limiting the placement and also salaries of Black educators, since salaries would relate to how well one did on

the test. This was one way in which other measures were taken to maintain a white dominance in the field while restricting access and opportunity to Black educators (Allison, 1999).

The Brown decision was implemented in such a way as to imply equality while supporting white group interests. One manifestation of this has been the ways in which Blacks and other people of color have been provided only limited access to the field. White multiculturalism may have been conceived of as a vehicle for transformative pedagogy it also fulfilled the role of providing white teachers with teaching strategies for their new multicultural student population. White teachers would now fill the vacant spaces that were opened as a result of Black educators being pushed out of the field.

One image that comes to mind is that of the white teacher in the inner city school who now has to figure out how to "deal with" her Black and Latino students. Multicultural education has become an important component in teacher education programs that serve communities of color. Within our own program at UNM we often encounter white teachers who ask, "How can I create a classroom that is culturally sensitive towards students of color?" These prospective teachers often see multiculturalism as a tool box of practices that will teach them how to incorporate or accommodate the unique needs and culture of students of color into the existing social structure. In this way, they see multiculturalism as a teaching strategy that will assist

them in doing things like teaching their students about tolerance, respect for diversity, and, ultimately, eliminating prejudice and discrimination.

What is amiss from this view of multiculturalism is any kind of serious attention given to a multicultural pedagogy that seeks to understanding racism as a social structure and all the implications of this. There is the assumption that teachers walk into classrooms as "deracialized" human beings devoid of ideology or any investment in their own group identity (McIntyre, 1997). Unless we unpack this, teachers are likely to enter classrooms and reproduce racial inequality even with multicultural training.

In sum, the racialization of the teacher workforce through integration resulted in the elimination of many jobs for middle-class Blacks. White teachers gained increased contact with and authority over Black students and other students of color. These same white teachers received a superficial multicultural education, one which avoided any significant interrogation of whiteness, in the their teacher education programs. In the classroom, white teachers avoid challenging our racialized social system and opt for colorblind ideologies and overt and covert racist practices. The curriculum, policies, administration, and counseling entities can get by with focusing on diversity while feeling no social or moral obligation to education students for social transformation. In these ways, multiculturalism functions to perpetuate white supremacy while revealing to us only a mask of change. Interest-convergence theory would suggest that this should not surprise us.

Thus, Derrick Bell's theory of interest-convergence leads us to a deeper structural understanding of how white supremacy is tied up with multiculturalism. With such a structural understanding, however, there is always the dilemma of agency. As multiculturalists and educators ourselves, we do believe that we have to remain hopeful in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds. In spite of our criticisms of multiculturalism, we do respect what is at times its hopeful nature and its commitment to work within schools. Even still, what counts as a hopeful form of agency in the face of "the permanence of racism" (Bell, 1992) is both complex and political. Given this context, we will conclude with a rough outline of a strategy for a multiculturalism that deals more directly with the problem of white privilege.

First, we need to develop communities of color as "communities of resistance" (Haymes, 1995; Sivanandan, 1990). Segregating students of color has now reemerged in the years since *Brown v. Board of Education*. With white flight and the construction of racially homogenous suburbs, whites have found a way to make sure that schools maintain their privileged position (Anyon, 1997). Even in integrated schools, students of color are disproportionately tracked into special education and other vocational curriculums, while white students are placed in gifted and enriched programs (Kozol, 1991; Oakes, 1986). Racism is reinvented even within the halls of integrated schools. This is something Civil Rights advocates did not count on—at least we hope not. Having contact with people of color has not caused whites to necessarily renounce their power

and transform structures. Having not achieved our goal of establishing integrated schools and also realizing that integrated schools rarely de-center power relations, we must consider other alternatives. For example, we must consider developing model minority schools (Bell, 1995) that would do more than just give students of color academic skills but also provide a setting in which they could comfortably address racial oppression, internalized racism, and ultimately engage in social activism. People of color need to examine the ways in which they have internalized whiteness and have been complicitous with white supremacy (Cross, 1991). They must fight against the denigrating images those whiteness projects upon them. Also, while it is true that white teachers fill the majority of teaching positions in public schools, teacher education programs must also direct its efforts towards providing entry in the field for people of color. Moreover, teacher education for teachers of color should emphasize theory and practice that promotes the notion of schooling as a community of resistance.

Also, communities of resistance need to focus on the political relations between communities of color. Different non-white racial groups need to forge solidarities at the same time as they recognize their differential skin privilege (Kim, 1993; Wu, 2002). In a white supremacist structure, darker-skinned groups tend to have less privilege than lighter-skinned groups due to how white fears are translated into policy and daily practice (Wade, 1993). Those lighter-skinned groups must figure out ways to gain solidarity with darker-skinned groups so as to form a more united coalition against whiteness. The

naming of power between groups of color is a neglected, even taboo, subject even in more radical forms of multiculturalism. However, a truly race-radical multiculturalism needs to deal with non-white race relations within this context if it is to avoid being complicitous with the interest convergence of whites.

Whites are certainly a piece of the puzzle as well. Multiculturalism needs to emphasize the transformation of white consciousness and the formation of solidarity among all peoples of color. A thorough critique of white power and privilege needs to become central to multiculturalism (Sleeter, 1993; Tatum, 1997). White teachers, who still comprise the vast majority of public school teachers, need to become versed in critical whiteness studies (McIntyre, 1997). Whites need to be released from their desire for white normalcy.

The authors believe that if multicultural education is to live up to its promise we must continue to interrogate the ways in which it, too, reinvents and reproduces whiteness. We need a more direct pedagogical approach to the problem of white supremacy, which means transforming those whites who are willing unlearn their white ideologies and become solidary with people of color and focusing more on a race-radical education for people of color that works for solidarity across non-white groups. We hope this paper will stir multicultural educators and scholars to intervene in the role that multiculturalism plays in white supremacy. However, we believe this intervention

cannot occur if we do not first begin to *understand* how the hidden curriculum of multiculturalism favors those already privileged.

References

Acuña, R. (1996). *Anything but Mexican: Chicanos in contemporary Los Angeles.* London and New York: Verso.

Allison, C. (1999). The southern teacher in the twentieth century: Race mattered. In, W. Urban (Ed.). *Essays in twentieth-century southern education* (pp. 101-127). New York and London: Garland Publishing.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (1992). African American scholarship and the evolution of multicultural education. *Journal of Negro Education, 61*(3), 273-286.

Banks, J. (1994). *An introduction to multicultural education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism.* New York: BasicBooks.

Bell. D. (1995). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest convergence dilemma. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 20-29). New York: New Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1996). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(June), 465-480.

Cheney, L. (1987). *American memory: A report on the humanities in our nation's public schools.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Cheney, L. (1990). *Tyrannical machines: A report on educational practices gone wrong and our best hopes for setting them right.* Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University.

Davis, J. E. (Ed.). (2001). *The Civil Rights Movement.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Dougherty, J. (1998). "That's when we were marching for jobs": Black teachers and the early Civil Rights Movement in Milwaukee. *History of Education Quarterly, 38*(2): 121-141.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black reconstruction in America.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Foster, M. (1997). *Black teachers on teaching.* New York: The New Press.

Gallagher, C. (1997). White racial formation: Into the twenty-first century. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 291-299). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Guinier, L., & Torres, G. (2002). *The miner's canary: Enlisting race, resisting power, transforming democracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Haymes, S. N. (1995). *Race, culture, and the city: A pedagogy for Black urban struggle*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Irvine, R., & Irvine, J. (1983). The impact of the desegregation process on the education of Black students: key variables. *Journal of Negro Education, 52*(4), 410-422.

Kim, E. (1993). Home is where the *han* is: A Korean American perspective on the Los Angeles Upheavals. In R. Gooding-Williams (Ed.), *Reading Rodney King: Reading urban uprising* (pp. 215-235). New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Harper Perennial Press.

Lipsitz, G. (1998). *The possessive investment in whiteness: How white people profit from identity politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLaren, P. (1997). *Revolutionary multiculturalism: Pedagogies of dissent for the new millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Morris, V., & Morris, C. (2002). *The price they paid: Desegregation in an African American community*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Oliver, M., & Shapiro, T. (1997). *Black wealth/white wealth: A new perspective on racial inequality*. New York and London: Routledge.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960's to the 1990's*. New York: Routledge.

Peller, G. (1995). Race-Consciousness. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 127-158). New York: New Press.

Roediger, D. (1999). *Wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class* (Rev. ed.). New York and London: Verso.

Siddle-Walker, V. (2000). Valued segregated schools for African American children in the South, 1935-1969: A review of common themes and characteristics. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 253-285.

Siddle-Walker, V. (2001). African American teaching in the South. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 751-779.

Sivanandan, A. (1990). *Communities of resistance: Writings on Black struggles for socialism*. London: Verso.

Sleeter, C. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 157-171). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tate, W., Ladson-Billings, G., & Grant, C. (1996). The Brown decision revisited: Mathematizing a social problem. In, M. J. Shujaa (Ed.), *Beyond desegregation: The politics of quality in African American schooling* (pp. 29-50). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York: BasicBooks.

Thompson, C. (1953). The Negro teacher and desegregation of the public schools. *The Journal of Negro Education, 22*(2), 95-101.

Wade, P. (1993). *Blackness and race mixture: The dynamics of racial identity in Columbia*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Watkins, W., Lewis, J., & Chou, V. (Eds.) (2001). *Race and education: The roles of history and society in educating African American students*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Wu, F. (2002). *Yellow: Race in America beyond Black and white*. New York: Basic Books.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Promise of Multiculturalism and the Permanence of Racism	
Author(s): Ricky Lee Allen & Natasha Howard	
Corporate Source: —	Publication Date: 4/22/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☒

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Rick L Allen	Printed Name/Position/Title: Dr. Ricky Lee Allen, Asst. Prof.
Organization/Address: U. of New Mexico, Dept. of LLSS Hokona Hall Room 209 Albuquerque, NM 87131-1231	Telephone: 505-277-7247 FAX: 505-277-8362 E-Mail Address: rlallen@unm.edu Date: 7/23/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)